

# **Evaluation of the Indianapolis Mayor Sponsored Charter Schools**

**Monument Lighthouse Charter School  
Monument Lighthouse College Prep Academy**

**Sixth-year Charter Review**

**2012-2013 School Year**

**Mary Jo Rattermann, Ph.D.**

# OFFICE OF EDUCATION INNOVATION

## Office of the Mayor of Indianapolis

### SIXTH YEAR CHARTER REVIEW

#### *Monument Lighthouse Charter School* *Monument Lighthouse College Prep Academy*

November 6-8, 2012 & January 28, 2013

---

The Indianapolis Mayor's Office Sixth Year Charter Review (SYCR) is designed to assess the 6<sup>th</sup> year of the school as it approaches the 7<sup>th</sup> year renewal process. The Sixth Year Charter Review Protocol is based on the *Performance Framework*, which is used to determine a school's success relative to a common set of indicators, as well as school-based goals.

***Consistent with the Indianapolis Mayor's Office Performance Framework, the following four core questions and sub-questions are examined to determine a school's success:***

- 1. *Is the educational program a success?***
  - 1.1. *Is the school making adequate yearly academic progress, as measured by the Indiana Department of Education's system of accountability?*
  - 1.2. *Are students making substantial and adequate gains over time, as measured using value-added analysis?*
  - 1.3. *Is the school outperforming schools that the students would have been assigned to attend?*
  - 1.4. *Is the school meeting its school-specific educational goals?*
- 2. *Is the organization effective and well-run?***
  - 2.1. *Is the school in sound fiscal health?*
  - 2.2. *Are the school's student enrollment, attendance, and retention rates strong?*
  - 2.3. *Is the school's Board active and competent in its oversight?*
  - 2.4. *Is there a high level of parent satisfaction with the school?*
  - 2.5. *Is the school administration strong in its academic and organizational leadership?*
  - 2.6. *Is the school meeting its school-specific organizational and management performance goals?*
- 3. *Is the school meeting its operations and access obligations?***
  - 3.1. *Has the school satisfactorily completed all of its organizational structure and governance obligations?*
  - 3.2. *Is the school's physical plant safe and conducive to learning?*
  - 3.3. *Has the school established and implemented a fair and appropriate pupil enrollment process?*
  - 3.4. *Is the school properly maintaining special education files for its special needs students?*
  - 3.5. *Is the school fulfilling its legal obligations related to access and services to students with limited English proficiency?*

**4. *Is the school providing the appropriate conditions for success?***

- 4.1. *Does the school have a high-quality curriculum and supporting materials for each grade?*
- 4.2. *Are the teaching processes (pedagogies) consistent with the school's mission?*
- 4.3. *For secondary students, does the school provide sufficient guidance on and support and preparation for post-secondary options?*
- 4.4. *Does the school effectively use learning standards and assessments to inform and improve instruction?*
- 4.5. *Has the school developed adequate human resource systems and deployed its staff effectively?*
- 4.6. *Is the school's mission clearly understood by all stakeholders?*
- 4.7. *Is the school climate conducive to student and staff success?*
- 4.8. *Is ongoing communication with students and parents clear and helpful?*

COMPLETION OF THE SIXTH YEAR CHARTER REVIEW

As part of its oversight of charter schools, the Office of Education Innovation of the Mayor of Indianapolis authorized Research & Evaluation Resources (RER) to conduct site visits of schools in their sixth year of operation. The purpose is to present the school and the Office of Education Innovation a professional judgment on conditions and practices at the school, which are best provided through an external perspective. This report uses multiple sources of evidence to understand the school's performance. Evidence collection begins before the visit with the review of key documents and continues on-site through additional document review, classroom visits and interviews with any number of stakeholders. Findings provided by the site visit team can be used to celebrate what the school is doing well and prioritize its areas for improvement in preparation for renewal. It is the task of the site visit team to report on the following pre-identified aspects of the *Performance Framework* and to assist the Office of Education Innovation in its completion of the SYCR Protocol: ***Responses to sub-questions 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7 and 4.8 of Core Question 4.***

The outcome of this review will provide the school with written report that includes a judgment and supporting evidence on various aspects of the school, based on a rubric of indicators<sup>1</sup> developed for each of the four core questions and sub-questions in the *Performance Framework*. The assessment system utilizes the following judgments:

*Does not meet standard*

*Approaching standard*

*Meets standard*

*Exceeds standard*

**Note:** In the case of the sub-questions under ***Core Question 4*** of the *Performance Framework*, there is no rating for *Exceeds standard*. *Meets standard* is the highest possible rating.

---

<sup>1</sup> Rubric indicators are subject to revision by the Office of Education Innovation.

# **Monument Lighthouse Charter School & Monument Lighthouse College Prep Academy**

## **School Specific Goals**

The mission of the Monument Lighthouse Charter School as described in the charter application is:

Students at the Monument Lighthouse Charter School will acquire the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes to be responsible citizens and effective workers. Students will realize this mission through a curriculum that infuses fine and performing arts into a rigorous core of content.

In the charter application, Monument Lighthouse Charter School proposed several educational goals which instantiated their school mission. Specifically:

Goal 1: All students will demonstrate academic success in all core subjects.

Goal 2: All students will make progress in all core academic subjects.

Goal 3: Students from all demographic groups within the MLCS will perform at comparably high achievement levels.

Goal 4: All students will contribute to at least one public art demonstration or performance each year.

Goal 5: Students will demonstrate hard work, personal responsibility, and respect according to school-developed standards.

Goal 6: Parents will demonstrate satisfaction with the school's programming and operation.

Goal 7: The school will be financially stable.

Goal 8: Retention of students

These goals have been modified over the course the past 6 years, and in an ambitious plan to address any goals that may not be met, Monument Lighthouse Charter School has been implementing a process to identify and address issues using the School Improvement Plan. In the SIP, Priority Areas for Improvement are identified, as is the population most impacted by the need for improvement. Based on data-analyses of the problem areas, a set of interventions is determined. Specific Priority Areas are:

Priority Area for Improvement 1-Student proficiency and growth in English/Language Arts

Priority Area for Improvement 2- Student proficiency and growth in Math

Priority Area for Improvement 3-Discipline

Each PAI include a description of the PAI based on the data from standardized testing and school-wide data gathering, as well as a Root Cause Analysis that includes leadership and teaching staffs view of the root causes of the need for improvement in E/LA, Math and Discipline. For example,

for the PAI analysis of discipline, it was noted that there were 484 Out-of-School suspensions in the previous school year, with a loss of 1499 days of school for these students. The root causes of these disciplinary issues included the increase of OSS from 3 days to 5, the Zero Tolerance policy that had been enacted for infractions such as profanity and other infractions, and changes in After-School Academy policies. Subsequent to the analysis of the PAI, a data-driven set of interventions are designed. Using discipline as an example again, Monument Lighthouse Charter School is developing classroom contracts to decrease behaviors that lead to OSS, creating student interventions plans that are carried out by the classroom teachers, and development of Student Focus Plans.

## **Background and History**

The Monument Lighthouse Charter School (MLCS) opened its doors in August 16, 2007, with Lighthouse Academies, Inc. as its charter management organization, who also managed the Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School, as well as four additional Lighthouse charters school in Gary and East Chicago. Monument Lighthouse began with an enrollment of X students in K-6, and grew to the current enrollment of X students in K-8. The Monument Lighthouse College Prep Academy (MLCPA) is in its second year of operation, with the current sophomore class being the first group of students enrolled at MLCPA. The class is quite small--28 students—the majority of whom were MLCS students who transitioned from the middle-school to the high school. During the course of this evaluation, three students withdrew from MLCPA, and ten new students enrolled.

All Lighthouse Academies schools adopt the same curriculum that includes Open Court, Saxon Math, FOSS, and Core Knowledge. Additionally, Understanding by Design and readers/writers' workshop are part of the curriculum of the Lighthouse Academies, Inc. Lighthouse Academies is currently transitioning their curriculum to the Common Core Standards. At this time, Lighthouse Academy schools in Indiana implement the Indiana State Standards in those classrooms that have not been transitioned to Common Core. In keeping with the Lighthouse Academies framework, classroom instruction should include a mix of whole-class, small group, and individual work.

## **The Evaluation Process**

This report represents an evaluation of performance in each of the standards and indicators that are the responsibility of RER to evaluate. According to the site visit process, the sixth year site visit will address only those standards that did not receive the rating of “Meets Standard” in the Performance Framework of the Office of Education Innovation of Mayor of Indianapolis. Consequently, the Monument Lighthouse Charter School and the Monument Lighthouse College Prep Academy were evaluated on indicators 4.1, 4.2, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8. A rating for Standard 4.3, *“For secondary students, does the school provide sufficient guidance on and support and preparation for post-secondary options?”* was not provided during the Fourth Year Site Visit because at that time the high school was not yet in existence. Since the high school had students enrolled at the time of the 6<sup>th</sup> year site visit this indicator will be included in this review.

Research & Evaluation Resources staff engaged in a number of evidence-collecting activities. The focus of this evaluation was to gauge perceptions of key stakeholders at the school in relation to the areas of the performance framework that are part of the evaluation. RER conducted focus group discussions with students, staff, and parents, as well as interviews with the school administration and Board members. These focus groups and interviews were conducted over the course of the fall of 2012. The Board of Directors interview was completed on September 11, 2012, while the teacher, student and parent focus groups took place from November 6-8, 2012.

A follow-up visit was performed on January 28, 2013 at the request of the Monument Lighthouse leadership. At the time of the follow up visit, Mrs. Lederach had resigned her position as Principal of the elementary school, having accepted the position of Principal at an elementary school closer to her home. Mrs. Kim Randall, who was serving as one of the two Directors of Instruction, became the new elementary school Principal. Additional personnel changes had also occurred, with Mr. Keith Story leaving his position as the second Director of Instruction to become Director of School Culture. Ms. Jessica Hood assumed Mr. Story's position as Director of Instruction. The second Director of Instruction position was at the time unfilled, although there are future plans to fill the position. During this visit, leadership interviews were conducted with Mr. Rent, Mrs. Randall and Mrs. Pies. The evaluator was also available to the teaching staff for impromptu discussions regarding the changes at the school. Four teachers took advantage of the opportunity to meet with the evaluator.

13 classrooms were observed using the instrument provided by the Office of Education Innovation. Each observation lasted approximately 27 minutes, and over half of the teaching staff was observed once. Classroom observers spent 6.62 hours (397 minutes) observing 13 classrooms, 213 students, and 14 teachers. The observed student to teacher ratio was 15:1. Two of the teachers were observed by both classroom observers at the same time in order to ensure inter-judge reliability. Please see Appendix A: Monument Lighthouse Charter School Classroom Observation Summary for a detailed analysis of the observations conducted.

In the following report, standards and indicators are listed with relevant evidence given related to the performance criteria. Following the discussion of each indicator, a summary of strengths and areas for attention are provided for the core question.

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**  
**MONUMENT LIGHTHOUSE CHARTER SCHOOL**  
**MONUMENT LIGHTHOUSE PREP ACADEMY**

<i>Core Question 1: Is the educational program a success?</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<i>Core Question 2: Is the organization effective and well-run?</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<i>Core Question 3: Is the school meeting its operations and access obligations?</i>	<i>Finding</i>
<i>3.4. Is the school properly maintaining special education files for its special needs students?</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<i>Core Question 4: Is the school providing the appropriate conditions for success?</i>	<i>Finding</i>
<i>4.1. Does the school have a high-quality curriculum and supporting materials for each grade?</i>	<b>Approaching Standard</b>
<i>4.2. Are the teaching processes (pedagogies) consistent with the school's mission?</i>	<b>Does not meet standard</b>
<i>4.3. For secondary students, does the school provide sufficient guidance on and support and preparation for post-secondary options?</i>	<b>Does not meet standard</b>
<i>4.4. Does the school effectively use learning standards and assessments to inform and improve instruction?</i>	<b>Meets Standard</b>
<i>4.5. Has the school developed adequate human resource systems and deployed its staff effectively?</i>	<b>Meets Standard</b>
<i>4.6. Is the school's mission clearly understood by all stakeholders?</i>	<b>Meets Standard</b>
<i>4.7. Is the school climate conducive to student and staff success?</i>	<b>Does not meet standard</b>
<i>4.8. Is ongoing communication with students and parents clear and helpful?</i>	<b>Meets Standard</b>

## Standard 4: Is the school providing the appropriate conditions for success?

4.1. Does the school have a high-quality curriculum and supporting materials for each grade?	
Does not meet standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>two or more</u> of the following areas: a) the curriculum does not align with the state standards; b) the school does not conduct systematic reviews of its curriculum to identify gaps based on student performance; c) the school does not regularly review scope and sequence to ensure presentation of content in time for testing; d) the sequence of topics across grade levels and content areas does not focus on core (prioritized) learning objectives; e) the staff lacks understanding and/or consensus as to how the curriculum documents and related program materials are used to effectively deliver instruction; f) there is a lack of programs and materials available to deliver the curriculum effectively.
Approaching standard	<b>The school presents significant concerns in <u>one</u> of the following areas: a) the curriculum does not align with the state standards; b) the school does not conduct systematic reviews of its curriculum to identify gaps based on student performance; c) the school does not regularly review scope and sequence to ensure presentation of content in time for testing; d) the sequence of topics across grade levels and content areas does not focus on core (prioritized) learning objectives; e) the staff lacks understanding and/or consensus as to how the curriculum documents and related program materials are used to effectively deliver instruction; f) there is a lack of programs and materials available to deliver the curriculum effectively.</b>
Meets standard	The school: a) curriculum aligns with the state standards; b) conducts systematic reviews of its curriculum to identify gaps based on student performance; c) the school regularly reviews scope and sequence to ensure presentation of content in time for testing; d) has a sequence of topics across grade levels and content areas that is prioritized and focuses on the core learning objectives; e) the staff understands and uniformly uses curriculum documents and related program materials to effectively deliver instruction; f) programs and materials are available to deliver the curriculum effectively.

The curriculums for both Monument Lighthouse Charter School and Monument Lighthouse College Prep Academy are fully aligned to the state standards (section a of the standard). Nearly every lesson plan provided by the teaching staff as part of the observation protocol identified the state standards. It was noted by the teaching staff during focus groups that they are frequently observed by school leaders, and that these classroom observations are used effectively during professional development as well as during staff performance evaluations. Monument Lighthouse schools benefit from the expertise and professional knowledge of the Director of Instruction for the Lower Academy, Mrs. Kim Randall, and the Director of Instruction for the Upper Academy, Mr. Keith Story. Mrs. Randall and Mr. Story conduct regular systematic review of the curriculum to identify gaps based on student performance, and educational practices at both Monument Charter schools are data driven. The teaching staff reports that they receive data from standardized assessments quickly and in a format that is easy for them to use. This data is used to drive curriculum revision and development (sections b & c of the standard).

The Directors of Instruction are also responsible for working with the Principals, Mr. Jagga Rent for the Monument Lighthouse Prep Academy, Mrs. Lisa Lederach and subsequent to her resignation, Mrs. Kim Randall, for the Monument Lighthouse Charter School, to ensure that scope and sequence of content aligns both horizontally within grades and vertically across grades. The majority of the grade level curriculum maps provided for the document review revealed a focus on core learning



objectives (section d of the standard). As noted below, however, classroom observations revealed that the teaching staff did not regularly use the program materials to deliver quality instruction. Classroom observations revealed that the student engagement in the lessons was not consistent, with only half of the class or a few students observed attending to the lesson. It is unclear whether the lack of quality implementation of the curriculum is due to a lack of understanding of the curriculum or the inability to implement it, but the outcome is a lack of effectively delivered instruction. (section e of the standard.)

Of greatest concern in this review is a troubling lack of supporting materials to deliver the curriculum effectively (section f of the standard). There is a widespread lack of materials for effective teaching and learning in all grades and all classrooms. The school lacks a library for students to borrow reading materials, and the teachers noted a lack of basic materials such as crayons, paper and other essential office supplies. The middle and high school students in particular noted the lack of a library, with one high school student stating “I just want something interesting to read.” Perhaps more unsettling, there is a lack of adequate textbooks for the students currently enrolled, and the textbooks that are available are often marked up from previous use and have not been updated since the school opened. During focus groups and interviews, both students and staff specifically noted how difficult it was to provide a challenging educational experience without materials and how demoralized they felt due to the lack of basic materials.

Also troubling is the status of educational technology in the school. Skilled use of information, media and technology is one of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills that form the Framework for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning. Students at MLCS do not have access to technology on a regular basis. There are no computers available for students in the classrooms, and only the basics in audio-visual equipment. What equipment is available is often not functional, and when functional is not being used by the teaching staff to aid in instruction. There is one computer lab available for the entire school that is exclusively used for testing. All of the students and teachers stated during interviews and focus groups that students do not have access to technology in their classrooms or in the school as a whole. When asked about their access to computers, a 4<sup>th</sup> grade student noted, “The only time we use the lab is for tests and Acuity and stuff.”

Particularly upsetting was the fact that the school possessed a set of netbooks designated for use by the high school students, but at the time of the site visit they had not been deployed due to a lack of professional development and infrastructure to support their use. An example of the total lack of infrastructure can be seen in the state of the wireless networks. Members of the teaching staff reported that when they try to access the internet through one of the few laptop computers available, the wireless internet connection fails. The wireless internet structure for the building is lacking, with entire classrooms without access to the wireless signal and the building divided into two different networks such that teaching staff has to quit one network and sign into the other if they move around the building.

## Observations from January 28, 2013

The changes in Monument Lighthouse Charter School that occurred during the relatively short time between site visits are dramatic. Due to the extraordinary effort of the teaching staff, and the strong leadership of Mrs. Randall, Mr. Rent and Mrs. Pies, many of the issues revolving around materials and access to technology found during the first site visit have been addressed. The lack of a school library was cited by both teachers and students as being particularly disheartening. As part of an effort to increase the cohesiveness of the teaching staff, Mrs. Randall engaged teachers in the task of building a library for the school over the holiday break. Through teamwork and dedication, Mrs. Randall and her staff were able to create a library with over 5,000 books for student use. At the time of this visit, an electronic checkout system was in the process of being implemented.

In addition to the creation of the school library, Lighthouse Monument Charter school also improved their student and staffs access to technology to a substantial degree. Lighthouse Academies, Inc. provided the resources to establish a second computer lab, as well as to provide additional desktop and laptop computers for staff and student use. In all, over 80 new computers have been introduced into the building, with plans for additional technology upgrades to occur in the upcoming months. Additionally, the laptop computers that were designated for the high school students are now being used in the classroom to improve their technology skills. Finally, Lighthouse Monument Charter School will be receiving new textbooks, aligned to the Common Core or Indiana State Standards, where appropriate, for use next academic year.

These changes, and other noted in later in this report, have greatly improved not just the access to materials at Lighthouse Monument Charter School, but have also improved the culture and spirit of the school. The teaching staff responded to the positive changes that were made and conveyed to the evaluator the belief that the school may be “on the right track” for success. Based on these new observations, the rating assigned for Standard 4.1 was changed from “Does not Meet Standard” to “Approaching Standard.”

*Areas of Strength:* The curriculum of Monument Lighthouse Charter School and Monument Lighthouse College Prep Academy are fully aligned to the state standards and staff and leadership regularly review the curriculum to ensure that there are meeting the needs of their students.

Instruction is data-driven, with the Directors of Instruction providing valuable expertise to the teaching staff.

*Recommendations:* Classroom materials and access to technology must be provided to students and staff as soon as possible. (It should be noted that this recommendation is currently being acted upon by Monument Lighthouse Charter School leadership and staff.)

4.2. Are the teaching processes (pedagogies) consistent with the school's mission?	
<b>Does not meet standard</b>	The school presents significant concerns in <b>two or more</b> of the following areas: a) the curriculum is not implemented in the majority of classrooms according to its design; b) as delivered, instruction is not focused on core learning objectives; c) the pace of instruction/lessons and content delivery lacks the appropriate rigor and challenge; d) instructional activities lack variety and/or limited use of differentiated strategies to engage a wide range of student interests, abilities and learning needs; e) staff do not receive feedback on instructional practices.
Approaching standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>one</u> of the following areas: a) the curriculum is not implemented in the majority of classrooms according to its design; b) as delivered, instruction is not focused on core learning objectives; c) the pace of instruction/lessons and content delivery lacks the appropriate rigor and challenge; d) instructional activities lack variety and/or limited use of differentiated strategies to engage a wide range of student interests, abilities and learning needs; e) staff do not receive feedback on instructional practices.
Meets standard	The school exhibits the following characteristics: a) the curriculum is implemented in the majority of classrooms according to its design; b) as delivered, instruction is focused on core learning objectives; c) the pace of instruction/lessons and content delivery possesses the appropriate rigor and challenge; d) instructional activities possess variety and/or use of differentiated strategies to engage a wide range of student interests, abilities and learning needs; e) supplies sufficient feedback to staff on instructional practices.

The curriculum was implemented in the majority of the classrooms (12 out of 13) as it was written on the lesson plans (section a of the standard). Further, a document analysis of the lesson plans and curriculum maps revealed the classroom instruction followed the pace and guidance of the curriculum maps, with the classroom teachers providing instruction on the topics scheduled for that week in the curriculum maps. The teaching staff noted during focus group interviews that the school leadership provided sufficient feedback to staff on instructional practices through walkthrough observations and professional communications (section e of the standard)

However, while the majority of the grade level curriculum maps revealed a focus on core learning objectives, this did not always translate into the classroom. Classroom observations revealed that as delivered, classroom instruction was not focused on core learning objectives (section b of the standard). Learning objectives were not clearly posted in the majority of classrooms (only 38% of classrooms had posted state standards and only 69% had posted core learning objectives) A focus on making learning objectives that are present in the curriculum more clearly implemented in the classroom would be an area for growth.

Classroom observations revealed that the pace of instruction provided the appropriate rigor and challenge in only 7 of the 13 classrooms observed (54%). Student engagement was not uniform across the observations, with many classrooms revealing that “half” or “few” of the students were observed to be attentive and engaged throughout the observation period. This was particularly problematic in the high school classes. Differentiated instruction was only observed in 3 out of 13 classrooms, a problem that was consistent across both schools (sections c & d of the standard).

A consistent problem at Monument Lighthouse schools during this school year has been the use of long-term substitute teachers in the classroom, with 5 classes being taught by substitutes at one point during the school year. As the students noted, “They did not do a good job teaching,” and another noted, “Our teacher said the sub taught us the wrong thing; and we had to start over.” It must be noted that the pregnancies and illnesses among the staff are not under the control of the Monument Lighthouse leadership, however, the large number of substitute teachers has had an effect on the quality of instruction and must be noted.

*Areas of Strength:* The Monument Lighthouse Charter Schools curriculum as designed is rigorous and challenging.

The teaching staff reports that they receive adequate feedback on instructional practices.

*Recommendations:* Efforts should be made to ensure that the core learning objectives and state standards are clear during instruction and are made a priority by the teaching staff.

The use of differentiated instruction in the classroom should be increased through more professional development or a school-wide supports.

The pace and quality of content delivery should be improved through more professional development or school-wide supports.

4.3 For secondary students, does the school provide sufficient guidance on and support and preparation for post-secondary options?	
<b>Does not meet standard</b>	The school presents significant concerns in two or more of the following areas: a) the school's academic program lacks challenging coursework (e.g., Advanced Placement courses, internships, independent study) to prepare students for rigorous post-secondary opportunities; b) there is a lack of high expectations to motivate and prepare students for post-secondary academic opportunities; c) insufficient material resources and personnel guidance are available to inform students of post-secondary options; d) limited opportunities exist for extracurricular engagement and activities (e.g., athletics, academic clubs, vocational) to increase post-secondary options; e) the school does not meet Indiana Core 40 graduation standard requirements.
Approaching standard	The school presents significant concerns in one of the following areas: a) the school's academic program lacks challenging coursework (e.g., Advanced Placement courses, internships, independent study) to prepare students for rigorous post-secondary opportunities; b) there is a lack of high expectations to motivate and prepare students for post-secondary academic opportunities; c) insufficient material resources and personnel guidance are available to inform students of post-secondary options; d) limited opportunities exist for extracurricular engagement and activities (e.g., athletics, academic clubs, vocational) to increase post-secondary options; e) the school does not meet Indiana Core 40 graduation standard requirements.
Meets standard	The school: a) has challenging coursework (e.g., Advanced Placement courses, internships, independent study) to prepare students for rigorous post-secondary opportunities; b) has high expectations to motivate and prepare students for post-secondary academic opportunities; c) has sufficient material resources and personnel guidance available to inform students of post-secondary options; d) presents opportunities for extracurricular engagement and activities (e.g., athletics, academic clubs, vocational) to increase post-secondary options; e) meets or exceeds Indiana Core 40 graduation standard requirements.

The Monument Lighthouse College Prep Academy opened on August 2, 2011 serving grades 8 through 9. The Academy currently serves 75 students in grades 8-10. Mr. Jagga Rent, the current principal, joined the Lighthouse Charter School staff in July of 2012. As designed, the Lighthouse Academies high school curriculum meets the requirements for Indiana Core 40 graduation and presents students with high expectations to motivate and prepare students for post-secondary opportunities (sections b & e of the standard). Examination of the curriculum maps and lesson plans revealed well-designed lessons that cover interesting and appropriate materials. Classroom observations, however, revealed that the quality of instruction varied greatly across the high school. In at least four of the five classroom observed it was noted that the quality of instruction was noticeably decreased due to a lack of good classroom management on the part of the classroom instructor. All of the classrooms were equipped with the technology basics- whiteboard, projector, and a computer for the instructor. It was noted in all the classrooms, however, that there was no technology available for student use.

There are no Advanced Placement, Honors, or independent study courses offered at the Monument Lighthouse College Prep Academy (section a of the standard). At the current time, the Monument Lighthouse College Prep Academy does not enroll Juniors or Seniors, making the need for these courses less pressing, and as school leadership has noted, Advanced Placement courses are appropriate for high school juniors and seniors. The Monument Lighthouse College Prep Academy is encouraged to provide challenging coursework for students as the current Sophomores become high school Juniors.

The leadership and teaching staff of Monument Lighthouse provide ample encouragement for their students to pursue post-secondary education. The students reported that the majority of the staff cared for them and wanted them to succeed in high school and continue their education in college. Students spoke positively of the Director of College Transitions, Mrs. Regena Dorsey. They noted that she was informative, approachable and was very supportive of their college plans. They did note, however, that at the current time she did not have enough time to offer them consistent guidance and counseling because she had many duties in addition to college counseling and, “that's why she can't give that enough focus, because she has so many other responsibilities here” (section c of the standard).

In conjunction with the Indianapolis Lighthouse Academy, visits to college campuses are arranged and paid for by the school. These visits play a crucial role in encouraging students to picture themselves on a college campus, and the Lighthouse Academies are to be applauded for their investment in these visits. However, despite the encouragement of leadership, teaching staff and guidance counselor, the unacceptable lack of basic materials for students, particularly access to technology, undermines their students belief that the pursuit of higher education is a realistic goal. During the student focus groups with the high school students, several students spoke very passionately about their desire to continue their education in college or trade school, but that in their view, the quality of the education that they were receiving at Monument Lighthouse College Prep Academy did not prepare them for the challenges of post-secondary education. Of particular concern to the students was the lack of technology and specifically, lack of access to computers and the internet. They rightly noted that their peers at other schools are learning the basics of technology literacy, the use of web-based resources, and the professional use of social media. They acutely feel the lack of this type of knowledge in their education and are not optimistic about their future education unless something changes. In fact, many of the students in the focus groups stated that they were planning to leave Monument Lighthouse College Prep Academy because of the quality of the education they were receiving. This was described by one student as “My mom doesn't think of this as a school, she thinks it's a place where you dump kids and that's why people are leaving” (section c of the standard).

Monument Lighthouse leadership and teaching staff work very hard to provide students with extracurricular activities at the middle and high school level, volunteering to coach athletics and act as faculty sponsors for student clubs. Unfortunately, there are not enough extracurricular activities to provide a full, well-rounded experience for the high school students ” (section d of the standard). The type of activities are limited by the chronic lack of resources that plague both schools. As the students noted, they have a very good cheerleading squad, but there is no football or basketball teams. The lack of team sports at the high school level is also a function of the small number of students currently enrolled, however, it is an issue that weighs heavily on the mind of the students, as noted in the focus groups, and plausible alternatives have not been offered to fill this gap. As one student noted, “We have never had dances, homecoming, sports like other schools.”

The high school students feel very strongly that they are not receiving the same quality of education that students at other high schools receive, and are very eloquent in their concerns for the future, stating, "If I have to stay here longer, I hope what we're saying makes something happen." and "It seems like every year someone comes in and talks to us and every year this stuff doesn't happen and it just gets worse."

*Areas of Strength:* The teaching staff is dedicated to the success of Monument Lighthouse Prep Academy students.

*Recommendations:* Access to technology is a crucial issue for high school students and must be addressed by the Lighthouse Academies leadership.

Additional extra-curricular activities need to be provided in order to keep students engaged in the life of the school.

Advanced Placement coursework must be put in place for the upcoming Junior class.

<b>4.4. Does the school effectively use learning standards and assessments to inform and improve instruction?</b>	
<b>Does not meet standard</b>	The school presents significant concerns in <u>two or more</u> of the following areas: a) standardized and/or classroom assessments are not accurate or useful measures of established learning standards/objectives; b) assessment results are not received by classroom teachers in a timely or useful manner to influence instructional decisions; c) assessments lack sufficient variety to guide instruction for a wide range of student learning abilities; d) there is limited frequency or use of assessments to inform instructional decisions effectively; e) assessment results are not used to guide instruction or make adjustments to curriculum.
<b>Approaching standard</b>	The school presents significant concerns in <u>one</u> of the following areas: a) standardized and/or classroom assessments are not accurate or useful measures of established learning standards/objectives; b) assessment results are not received by classroom teachers in a timely or useful manner to influence instructional decisions; c) assessments lack sufficient variety to guide instruction for a wide range of student learning abilities; d) there is limited frequency or use of assessments to inform instructional decisions effectively; e) assessment results are not used to guide instruction or make adjustments to curriculum.
<b>Meets standard</b>	<b>The school: a) standardized and/or classroom assessments are accurate and useful measures of established learning standards/objectives; b) assessment results are received by classroom teachers in a timely and useful manner to influence instructional decisions; c) assessments have sufficient variety to guide instruction for a wide range of student learning abilities; d) there is sufficient frequency or use of assessments to inform instructional decisions effectively; e) assessment results are used to guide instruction or make adjustments to curriculum.</b>

Monument Lighthouse Charter School uses data driven instruction throughout the curriculum. The teaching staff reported that they perform a variety of formal and informal in class assessments, and that they receive the results of the standardized testing promptly and in a format that they can use (section b of the standard). The assessments observed were in keeping with established learning standards (section a of the standard) and had sufficient variety to guide instruction for differentiation and a wide range of student abilities (section c of the standard). The teaching staff reported that assessments were given with appropriate frequency and were useful in informing instructional decision-making (section d of the standard) and to guide adjustments to the curriculum (section e of the standard).

During focus groups, the teaching staff was very clear that much of the credit for the effective use of data in instruction and curriculum development belongs to Mrs. Randall and Mr. Story. Since both of these staff members have been assigned greater responsibilities and are no longer Directors of Instruction, it is crucial that their replacements have the same skill and dedication shown by their predecessors.

*Areas of Strength:* The use of data at Monument Lighthouse Charter Schools is to be commended.

*Recommendations:* Ensure that changes in staff roles do not lead to a decrease in the quality and use of assessment data.



<b>4.5. Has the school developed adequate human resource systems and deployed its staff effectively?</b>	
<b>Does not meet standard</b>	The school presents significant concerns in <u>two or more</u> of the following areas: a) hiring processes are not organized to support the success of new staff members; b) inefficient or insufficient deployment of faculty and staff limits instructional time and capacity; c) faculty and staff are not certified/trained in areas to which they are assigned; d) professional development (PD) does not relate to demonstrated needs for instructional improvement; e) PD is not determined through analyses of student attainment and improvement; f) the teacher evaluation plan is not explicit and regularly implemented with a clear process and criteria.
<b>Approaching standard</b>	The school presents significant concerns in <u>one</u> of the following areas: a) hiring processes are not organized to support the success of new staff members; b) inefficient or insufficient deployment of faculty and staff limits instructional time and capacity; c) faculty and staff are not certified/trained in areas to which they are assigned; d) professional development (PD) does not relate to demonstrated needs for instructional improvement; e) PD is not determined through analyses of student attainment and improvement; f) the teacher evaluation plan is not explicit and regularly implemented with a clear process and criteria.
<b>Meets standard</b>	<b>The school exhibits the following characteristics: a) hiring processes are organized and used to support the success of new staff members; b) the school deploys sufficient number of faculty and staff to maximize instructional time and capacity; c) faculty and staff are certified/trained in areas to which they are assigned; d) professional development (PD) is related to demonstrated needs for instructional improvement; e) PD opportunities are determined through analyses of student attainment and improvement; f) the teacher evaluation plan is explicit and regularly implemented with a clear process and criteria.</b>

Hiring practices at the Monument Lighthouse schools follows the procedures of the Lighthouse, Academies, Inc. Using an online system, the Principal has access to the applications submitted for the position and decides which candidates are appropriate for a phone meeting. Candidates can receive two phone interviews and these phone interviews may involve members of the School Talent Committee. Those candidates who are approved after the phone interview are brought to the school for a personal interview (section a of the standard). Interview procedures includes personal interviews, sample lessons and a series of phone interviews. The hiring process appears to be rigorous and appropriate for this school.

All teachers at Monument Lighthouse Charter School and at Monument Lighthouse Prep Academy are certified or credentialed in their teaching area. (section d of the standard). The majority of the teachers are teaching a course load that appears manageable, and the various staff members have distinct roles. The teachers are all teaching in areas in which they are certified. Overall, the staff is deployed to best utilize their skills and training, although in several classrooms it was noted that the student to teacher ratio was quite high, leading to problems with classroom management (section b of the standard.)

Hiring is performed according to the human resource processes of the Lighthouse Academies. The teacher evaluation plan is also designed by the Lighthouse Academies, and is comparable to the state mandated RISE evaluation system. As reported by the teaching staff, the teacher evaluation system

is regularly implemented and understood by the staff and leadership, with clear processes and criteria for the evaluation plan (section f of the standard).

The teaching staff is very happy with the quality of Professional Development being offered and spoke highly of the Directors of Instruction and their ability to plan and implement the professional development needed to maintain quality instruction. Interviews with the Directors of Instruction revealed that they were implementing the commonly accepted best practices for providing professional development, and that their PD was extremely data-driven. In fact, the use of data to drive instruction, provide feedback to the teaching staff and to inform professional development was exemplary (sections d & e of standard).

*Areas of Strength:* The use of data to inform and improve instruction is very well done.

*Recommendations:* None at this time.

4.6. Is the school's mission clearly understood by all stakeholders?	
Does not meet standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>both</u> of the following areas: a) significant disagreements exist among stakeholders about the school's mission; b) there is a lack of widespread knowledge and commitment to the intentions of the school's mission.
Approaching standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>one</u> of the following areas: a) significant disagreements exist among stakeholders about the school's mission; b) there is a lack of widespread knowledge and commitment to the intentions of the school's mission.
<b>Meets standard</b>	<b>The school: a) has a mission that is shared by all stakeholders; b) has stakeholders possessing widespread knowledge and commitment to the intentions of the school's mission.</b>

The School Mission is that of the Lighthouse Academies, Inc. As stated in their application students will acquire the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes to be responsible citizens and effective workers through an arts infused curriculum. The teaching staff and leadership all understand the school mission and are providing a challenging education to the best of their ability (section a of the standard). As with other aspects of the school, their ability to provide their students with a challenging curriculum and to infuse the arts into the curriculum is hampered by a lack of materials. Teachers recounted that they do not have enough basic art supplies, such as crayons and paper, for their students. Providing a rigorous curriculum is also hindered by the lack of updated textbooks and limited access to technology and the internet.

As noted previously, there have been major changes in the organization of the Board of Directors and many of the members of the LAI Board are new to their positions. The Board appears to be very aware of the mission of the schools, as well as of their current challenges that they face.

The one area of concern regarding the school mission is the degree to which parents are invested in the mission. Discussions during the parent focus groups suggested that for many parents the overarching reason for enrolling their students in the Monument Lighthouse schools was a lack of a viable alternative among the other traditional public schools in the area, combined with an unusual and highly disliked system of busing that had recently been implemented by the Metropolitan School District of Lawrence Township. While the parents spoke highly of Monument Lighthouse, there was very little evidence of either an understanding of the arts-infused curriculum or value placed on the role of the arts in their child's education, displaying a lack of widespread knowledge and commitment to the school's mission (section b of the standard).

*Areas of Strength:* The School Mission is compelling, and the teaching staff, school leadership, parent and Board of Directors are in agreement as to the vision of the school.

*Recommendations:* Parents are not fully aware of the mission of the Monument Lighthouse schools and would benefit from that mission being more clearly and consistently conveyed to them.

4.7. Is the school climate conducive to student and staff success?	
Does not meet standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>two or more</u> of the following areas with no evidence of a credible plan to address them: a) The school does not have clearly stated rules that enforce positive behavior; b) the school's discipline approach does not possess high expectations for student behavior; c) interactions between faculty and students are disrespectful and/or unsupportive and there are non-existing or unclear processes for resolution of conflicts; d) interactions between faculty and administration are unprofessional and/or unproductive.
Approaching standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>one</u> of the following areas with no evidence of a credible plan to address it: a) The school does not have clearly stated rules that enforce positive behavior; b) the school's discipline approach does not possess high expectations for student behavior; c) interactions between faculty and students are disrespectful and/or unsupportive and there are non-existing or unclear processes for resolution of conflicts; d) interactions between faculty and administration are unprofessional and /or unproductive.
Meets standard	The school exhibits the following characteristics: a) the school has clearly stated rules that enforce positive behavior; b) the school's discipline approach possesses high expectations for student behavior; c) interactions between faculty and students are respectful and supportive and faculty and students are clear about processes for resolution of conflicts; d) interactions between faculty and administration are professional and constructive.

The school climate at the Monument Lighthouse schools is a complicated picture. There are clearly stated rules for student behavior and both the leadership and the teaching staff recognize the importance of school culture and consistent discipline in providing an environment for learning. At the time of the site visit, however, these rules were not being used to enforce positive behavior (section a of the standard). Among the teaching staff there were conflicting views of the current discipline policies, as well as differing views of discipline in the past. Specifically, the new leadership has brought a new approach to student discipline and has done away with the use of "blue folders." A blue folder is begun for a student when a disciplinary action is required. Printed on these folders are places to record the basic facts of the student infraction, such as date, time, location, the nature of the offense and the disciplinary response. These blue folders have taken on a somewhat symbolic meaning for the teaching staff and the students and in the past were used widely to administer discipline. The topic of discipline and the blue folders led to a the following exchange during one of the teacher focus groups:

T2: In the past there has been a very clear discipline plan. "Blue Folders" was a very successful program; however, administration was concerned with the amount of suspensions, so that system has gone away.

T1: It used to be if you asked a student, "If I get out your blue folder, and write it in it, what will happen?" The students knew what would happen. If they aren't given consequences which are reinforced, then they are enabled to continue to misbehave. Now we're seeing students who for three years have not been a discipline issue and suddenly they are.

T3: There is a "Lighthouse Handbook," that breaks down specifically what the process is and we are not following that handbook.

T4: I know there are policies in place, but it seems the new administration is not honoring how discipline was handled in the past.

T1: There's very little administrative hands-on tackling of discipline issue. We are losing families as a result of this inconsistent discipline. I don't know where to put a "Blue Folder" now, I don't know who to give it to, I don't know who to ask about stuff.

It is important to note that according to the school mission, as well as that of the Lighthouse Academies, the Monument Lighthouse schools are practicing the *Responsive Classroom* model of discipline, and that the “blue folders” are not part of this model. However, during teacher focus groups many of the teaching staff either did not know that they were supposed to be implementing the Responsive Classroom, or felt that they had not received enough training in the responsive classroom techniques to use it properly. The staff is heavily invested in the blue folders and the disciplinary system they represent—in the face of this investment it will be very difficult to fully implement the Responsive Classroom model.

The teacher focus groups, student focus groups and leadership interviews all revealed that the current disciplinary system and resulting school culture is not supportive of student learning or engagement with the school as a whole. There is however, no agreement regarding how to improve the current school culture. Among the staff, students and parents there are diverging views of the impact of the “blue folders” and the overall discipline plan in place in the 2011-2012 school year. Many teachers noted that in the previous year the discipline system, of which noting disciplinary issues in the blue folders was a large part, was very effective and allowed the school to improve student test scores. Other teachers were not as sanguine about the culture and the previous school year, and do not believe that the processes of the past were effective. The parents interviewed were quite clear—they did not believe that in the past the school disciplinary system was effective or fair. They noted that when they visited their students’ classrooms in the past that there was often “no learning happening,” and that their students were often censured for petty and inconsequential offenses. Overall, they felt that the discipline procedures this year were an improvement.

The student noted that last year the discipline varied greatly from teacher to teacher, and that they could be “written up” in their blue folder for small infractions by one teacher, while another would ignore major disruptions. The students still felt that in many cases the current discipline policy was still as arbitrary as in the past, but they did not express any regret over the lack of blue folders.

It appears that the Monument Lighthouse schools do possess a discipline approach that has high expectations for student behavior, but this approach is not being implemented (section b of the standard). There is a lack of consistent discipline by the teaching staff, and a lack of commitment to the Responsive Classroom model. There is a noticeable longing for the “blue folders” and the perception that the school culture and disciplinary procedures of the previous year were far more effective than the procedures currently in place. Whether or not this is true, this attitude has been a roadblock to applying a consistent disciplinary system in the current school year.

Respectful communications between students and the teaching staff was also problematic. (section c of the standard). Students reported that they were often yelled at by the teaching staff, and that certain teachers were well known to use expletives and curse words during class. They also noted that some teachers demeaned students and spoke to them disrespectfully. While it is not unusual for students to complain about their teachers, these complaints were consistent across the student focus groups conducted with the middle and high school students. Further, members of the site visit team witnessed teachers yelling at students during passing periods and at dismissal. When asked about yelling at students, the teaching staff replied that they were yelling. “not to be yelling at scholars but to get their attention, “ and that “Not every classroom has great classroom management – but the majority do....and so in those classrooms then you would have more yelling; and finally, “the kids push and push and push..”To be clear, the majority of the interactions between students and teachers were respectful and conducive to the learning, however, a minority of staff members showing disrespect to students can negatively impact the school culture for everyone.

Interactions between members of the teaching staff appear to be friendly and respectful, with many staff members noting that they were like “a family” (section d of the standard). The teaching staff was very appreciative of the hard work done by Directors of Instruction and believed that they were essential to any successes that the Monument Lighthouse Charter schools had achieved. The teaching staff had not come to any judgment regarding the new school leaders, Mr. Rent and Mrs. Lederach, but they did express their overall dissatisfaction with the leadership change as a whole, and the new direction of the school. When asked their experiences at Monument Lighthouse under the previous leadership, several teachers noted that while the previous principal may have been difficult to work with, she was always “consistent” and they knew where they stood. There was a noted resistance to change among the teaching staff, despite the fact that there were clearly issues with the previous administration. The teaching staff exhibited great pride in their schools, with several members of the teaching staff noting that they had been successfully educating students for the past 5 years, and that in the past the school had received an A grade from the state Board of Education. It appears that the reasons for replacing the previous school leader were not well communicated to the staff, and several did not understand why new leadership was brought in. Most tellingly, one teacher stated that if the principal had to be removed, “it would have been better if the teachers had been left to run the school. We know what we’re doing and we don’t need the new principals.”

Mrs. Randall assuming the role of Principal may improve the quality of the interactions between leadership and teaching staff. While Mrs. Lederach was professional and respectful in her interactions with the staff, she had not yet won the acceptance and respect of the teaching staff. Mrs. Randall has earned that respect through her work as a Director of Instruction and may find that her good relationship with the staff will carry over into her new role.

### **Observations from January 28, 2013**

Four members of the teaching staff took the opportunity to speak to the evaluator during the return visit, so it is important to keep in mind that this is a limited sample. That being said, the teachers

who participated in the additional interviews noted that while staff relationships were sometimes still difficult, great strides had been made in bringing the faculty together. They were proud of the teamwork required to build the school library. Further, the teachers interviewed expressed their confidence in Mrs. Randall and her ability to lead the school. It is important to note that one of the four teachers interviewed still expressed some reservations regarding whether the staff had overcome the rifts noted above, but conceded that currently there was a general calm within the teaching staff.

*Areas of Strength:* The teaching staff is very proud of their school and its achievements.

*Recommendations:* Provide support to Mrs. Randall and Mr. Rent as they work to fully implement a disciplinary process that both works for the entire school and is fully implemented by the staff.

Provide opportunities for the teaching staff and leadership to work together toward common goals and experience success as a group.

<b>4.8. Is ongoing communication with students and parents clear and helpful?</b>	
Does not meet standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>two or more</u> of the following areas: a) there is a lack of active and ongoing communication between the school and parents; b) school communication is neither timely nor relevant to the parental concerns; c) student academic progress and achievement reports are not clearly reported and/or misunderstood; d) the school's communication methods are not well-designed to meet the needs of a diverse set of parents (e.g., not communicating in parents' native languages, communicating only in writing when many parents cannot read, holding meetings at inconvenient times for parents).
Approaching standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>one</u> of the following areas: a) there is a lack of active and ongoing communication between the school and parents; b) school communication is neither timely nor relevant to the parental concerns; c) student academic progress and achievement reports are not clearly reported and/or misunderstood; d) the school's communication methods are not well-designed to meet the needs of a diverse set of parents (e.g., not communicating in parents' native languages, communicating only in writing when many parents cannot read, holding meetings at inconvenient times for parents).
<b>Meets standard</b>	<b>The school: a) has active and ongoing communication between the school and parents; b) utilizes communications that are both timely and relevant to the parental concerns; c) communicates student academic progress and achievement in reports that are understood by parents; d) the school's communication methods are designed to meet the needs of a diverse set of parents (e.g., communicating in parents' native languages, not communicating only in writing when many parents cannot read, holding meetings at convenient times for parents).</b>

Monument Lighthouse schools have had a family coordinator position since the school opened. The position is currently held by Mr. DaRale Walton. Mr. Walton was hired very close to the beginning of the school year, and is currently learning all the responsibilities of his position. As he noted, his main responsibility is to maintain and increase enrollment in the Monument Lighthouse schools, as well as to act as a liaison between parents and the school. Mr. Walton comes to the position with a wealth of experience working with people from his previous positions as a minister, however, he did not have any experience with parent engagement or outreach and is currently working to catch up. It is highly recommended that he receive professional development in the area of parent engagement.

Parents reported that the communications from the school were frequent and useful, and that the school used a variety of communication methods to reach them (phone, email, and in some instances texts). The parents noted that communications were timely and relevant, and that the teaching staff was friendly and helpful (sections a, b and d of the standard). They all noted that the parent teacher conferences were informative and very useful to them and that, on the whole, they felt informed of their student's academic progress (section c of the standard). They also noted that the school sent out many telephone blasts and email messages informing them of school events and,



on several occasions this year, of school lockdowns. Overall, the parents reported feeling welcome in the school, respected by the teachers and were happy with the Monument Lighthouse schools.

*Areas of Strength:* Parent satisfaction is very high, and the parents value the education their children are receiving at the Monument Lighthouse Charter School.

*Recommendations:* Mr. Walton is new to the position of parent liaison and needs to be provided with more professional development in order to fully perform his role.

## **Appendix A:**

### **Monument Lighthouse Charter School and Monument Lighthouse College Prep Academy**

#### **Classroom Observation Summary**

Thirteen classrooms were observed using the instrument provided by the Office of Education Innovation. Each observation lasted approximately 30 minutes, and over half of the teaching staff was observed once. Classroom observers spent 6.62 hours (397 minutes) observing 13 classrooms, 213 students, and 14 teachers. On average, each observation lasted 27 minutes and the observed student to teacher ratio was 15:1. Two of the teachers were observed by both classroom observers at the same time in order to ensure inter-judge reliability.

#### **Classroom Environment**

69.2% (9/13) had posted objectives. 38.4% (5/13) had posted state standards. 69.2% (9/13) used critical vocabulary. 84.6% (11/13) had challenging content. 0.0% (0/13) exhibited differentiation. 92.3% (12/13) of the instruction observed built on prior knowledge.

#### **Learning Environment**

The observers categorized observed learning experiences into four main categories. 30.8% (4/13) of observed activities were Remember/Understand Activities. 61.5% (8/13) were Apply/Perform Activities. 38.4% (5/13) was Analyze/Evaluate Activities. 15.4% (2/13) were Create/Design Activities. 0.0% (0/13) of activities were found to be ineffective.

69.2% (9/13) of classrooms contained rich print materials. 53.8% (7/13) showed examples of exemplary work. 61.5% (8/13) displayed a daily schedule. 84.6% (11/13) had posted behavior expectations. 69.2% (9/13) had culturally relevant materials.

#### **Behavior Management**

The site team observed proactive and reactive techniques. The site team recorded 12 (92.3%) classrooms using proactive discipline. 13 (100%) classrooms using reactive discipline were recorded. Student engagement was fairly consistent. Please see the table below.

## Site Visit Classroom Observations

Number of Site Visitors: 2

Total Time Observing (Min)	Average Time in Classroom
397	27

Students Observed	Teachers Observed	Ratio (S:1T)
213	14	15

Topic of Lesson	
Math/Science	Hebrews & Judaism
Shapes/Stained Glass Window	Phase of the Moon
Writing Name	Music Class
Frogs/Reading Skills	Persuasive Essays
Math/Order of Operations	Math Equations
Read Aloud	Martin Luther King
Vocabulary Review	

Proportion of Students Engaged During:	All		Most		Half		Few		None	
	#	% Total	#	% Total	#	% Total	#	% Total	#	% Total
Beginning of Lesson	5	38.5%	5	38.5 %	1	7.6%	2	15.4%	0	0.0%
First Interval	5	38.5 %	5	38.5 %	2	15.2%	1	7.6%	0	0.0%
Second Interval	5	38.5 %	4	30.7%	3	23.1%	1	7.6%	0	0.0%
Third Interval	5	38.5 %	4	30.7%	4	30.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%